



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 19

Robert E. Adamowski
13232 NE 3th Street
Bellevue, WA 98005

MAILED

SEP 23 2010

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Patent No. 5,980,902
Issued: November 9, 1999
Application No.: 09/048,966
Filing Date: March 26, 1998
Attorney Docket No. **53000/1001**

:
: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
:
:
:

This is a request for information in response to the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), filed May 24, 2010, to reinstate the above-cited patent.

Petitioner is allowed a non-extendable period for reply of **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mailing date of this communication to provide a response. The response should be titled, "Response to Request for Information." If no response is provided within the period set forth, a decision will be made solely on the merits as set forth in the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b) filed September 28, 2009. No additional fees are due.

The patent issued November 9, 1999. The 7.5 year maintenance fee could have been paid from May 24, 2006, through November 24, 2006, or with a surcharge, as authorized by 37 CFR 1.20(h), during the period from November 25, 2006, to November 9, 2007. Petitioner did not do so. Accordingly, the patent expired at midnight on November 9, 2007.

Petitioner is required to address the following points¹:

- A successful petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b) must affirmatively identify the cause of the delay in paying the maintenance fee and provide a statement from every person with first-hand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the delay in paying the maintenance fee. Petitioner must provide statements from any person who may have been charged with paying the maintenance fee and statements from any person with first-hand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the failure to pay the maintenance fee.

¹ It is noted that the instant petition does not provide much detail as to the reason for the delay in paying the 7.5-year maintenance fee. It appears that the petitioner is asserting that a docketing error was the cause of the delay in paying the 7.5-year maintenance fee. As such, the instant Request for Information is based on the assertion that a docketing error was the cause of the delay in paying the maintenance fee. If this is not the case, petitioner is still required to respond to this Request for Information within the time period allowed setting for the circumstances of the delay in paying the maintenance fee. In so doing, petitioner is cautioned that it is not sufficient to simply state that the delay was unavoidable; petitioner must make a showing—through documentary evidence and statements of persons with first-hand knowledge—that the entire delay was unavoidable.

- 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) sets forth that a petition submitted under this portion of the Code of Federal Regulations must include a showing which is described as follows:

A showing that the delay was unavoidable since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent. The showing must enumerate the steps taken to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly.

Petitioner must, therefore, describe the steps that were in place to ensure that the maintenance fee was timely paid. This showing would include an explanation of who was responsible for paying tracking and paying the maintenance fee and the method this person, or entity, used for tracking the maintenance fee.

- Section 711.03(c)(2) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, provides, in pertinent part that:

In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." *Smith v. Mossinghoff*, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." *Haines v. Quigg*, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

A delay resulting from an error (e.g., a docketing error) on the part of an employee in the performance of a clerical function may provide the basis for a showing of "unavoidable" delay, provided it is shown that:

- (A) the error was the cause of the delay at issue;
- (B) there was in place a business routine for performing the clerical function that could reasonably be relied upon to avoid errors in its performance; and
- (C) the employee was sufficiently trained and experienced with regard to the function and routine for its performance that reliance upon such employee represented the exercise of due care.

A delay resulting from an error, such a docketing error, on the part of an employee in the performance of a clerical function may provide the basis for a showing of unavoidable delay. Such a showing should identify the specific error, the individual who made the error, and the business routine in place for performing the action which resulted in the error. The showing must establish that the individual who erred was sufficiently trained and experienced with regard to the function and routine for its performance that reliance upon such employee represented the exercise of due care. The showing should include information regarding the training provided to the personnel responsible for the docketing error, degree of supervision of their work, examples of other work functions carried out, and checks on the described work which were used to assure proper execution of assigned task.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Commissioner for Patent
Mail Stop Petitions
Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1460

By facsimile: (571) 273-8300
Attn: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3222.

/Kenya A. McLaughlin/

Kenya A. McLaughlin
Petition Attorney
Office of Petitions